

The NEWSLETTER that gives you

The KEY to the NEWS,

The DRIFT of the TIMES,

And the AMERICAN POINT OF VIEW

Close Up

Year Twelve

Number Three

February 10, 1956

DEAR AMERICAN -

WHO AGREES WITH THE STATEMENT OF HERBERT HOOVER, THAT:

"The spirit of nationalism springs from the deepest of human emotions. It arises from the yearnings of men to be free of foreign domination, to govern themselves. It springs from a thousand rills of race, of history, of sacrifice and pride in national achievement."

AND SO; AS WE REVIEW HAPPENINGS THE WORLD OVER - WHETHER THEY BE THE ACT OR aftermath of the death of Colonialism; the resistance to compulsory integration; the struggle against Zionism, Communism, domination of controlled mediums of publicity; or a hundred other similar happenings which can be mentioned - *the keynote of all is man's inborn urge to do as he desires, so long as he does not deliberately injure his fellow man.*

AMERICAN HISTORY HAS PROVED THAT NATIONALISM AND LIBERTY ARE BLOOD-TWINS. YET WE FEEL them slipping from our grasp. What to do about it? That's the problem! To think and act rightly, we know that we must have the facts. Simple experience is not enough. Aristotle, sensing that turmoil and disaster had come of Athenian democracy, spoke out against Plato's communism, saying:

"Let us not disregard the experience of the ages; surely, in the multitude of years, these things if they are good, would not have remained unknown."

And Athens declined to nothingness, never to recover.

People, seeking a better tomorrow, are inclined to forget the mistakes of yesterday which led to today's plight. They want today's facts, not yesterday's lessons. But, to uncover the facts is difficult because of today's planned confusion and its resulting chaos. The individual is placed in the position of the patron of a cook in Williston, North Dakota who recently proved that when ketchup, mustard, pickles and relish are served in a bun, the patron doesn't notice the absence of the hamburger.

LEST THE ABOVE BE CONSIDERED FACETIOUS, LET US REVIEW BRIEFLY, A PARTIAL RECORD OF THE courtmartial of Billy Mitchell on October 28, 1925. The questioner is Gullion, an army prosecutor:

"Gullion: You seem to have quite a bit to say about Hawaii, Colonel. For example you write that 'Pearl Harbor has no adequate defense against air attack' . . . and that a foreign power could attack and reduce the Hawaiian Island in a matter of minutes. Do you actually believe that?

"Mitchell: I not only believe it; if you will look into those letters, you'll find my specific observation as how it can be done.

"Gullion: I was coming to that . . . Your letter dated Dec. 14th, 1923. I'll read this slowly and distinctly because I want the court to know that you are second to none. That you are an expert in palmistry, table tipping and the reading of tea leaves . . . I'll let your words speak for themselves. 'Preceded by scouting submarines, enemy air craft carriers will lay off the Island of Oahu at a distance of about 150 miles. The attack will be launched in two waves and without warning. The first wave will strike at **Pearl Harbor, Scofield Barracks and the Ford Island Airdrome**, and the naval fuel and ammunition dumps. The attack will be followed by a second shortly thereafter, its objective being the city and wharves of Honolulu.' . . . Now, there's one piece of information I couldn't seem to find in your communications. Perhaps you could enlighten us. Does your crystal ball reveal by what enemy this mythical attack will be made?"

To an intelligent, specially qualified courtmartial board, Gullion had truth on his side; Billy Mitchell was fantastically and criminally stupid. Only one officer dissented - an officer named Douglas Arthur MacArthur.

WHICH BRINGS US TO . . . the latest notes from Moscow and the visit of Sir Anthony Eden, all as preliminary to World War IV in the offing! Mr. Eden is in trouble at home. So is Mr. Eisenhower, though he seems unaware of it. Both are personally rather nice chaps and both are plagued by ill health. If you do not believe that such a state of affairs will influence what you say and do, think a moment of how you, personally, act in similar circumstances. But, there's a difference. When, as a nice chap in ill health, you pull a boner, you can apologize, repair the damage — but to a chief of state or prime minister this course is verboten —

UNLESS . . . the assertion of Mr. Dulles (also a nice chap in ill health) that within the past eighteen months America has stood, three times, on the threshold of war **can be interpreted as such an apology!** During this same period the White House repeatedly stated that we have been closer to peace than for many years. Then comes the question, which statement was the boner, which the apology? If, as Mr. Eisenhower has stated, we've been so close to peace, how could we also be on the threshold of war? Or, reversing the order of the question: if what Mr. Dulles said is true (and Mr. Eisenhower has not denied it, nor does Closer-Up) and if we really have been on the verge of war three times—and apparently without the knowledge of Congress—is it **self-evident that Mr. Eisenhower has been personally about to plunge the nation into war without warning? Not just once, but three times since his advent to office?** And he's raising the score to four by maintaining silence in the face of a crisis in the Middle East?

THE MIDDLE EAST WAR CRISIS WAS TREATED EXTENSIVELY IN LAST CLOSER-UP. THE SITUATION HAS eased in no respect whatsoever. Since the beginning of the year, Washington has been flooded with delegations, conventions and meetings of the representatives of U. S. and World Jewry — all pointed toward putting political pressure on Eisenhower, Dulles and Congress; to not just supply arms to Israel; but also to demand that U. S. and Britain guarantee to protect Israel's stolen borders. As we go to press the pressure is having its effect. In replying to a letter from 40 Republican and 87 Democratic House members that "Israel be allowed to obtain in the open market such weapons as would assure her **protection** against aggression"; Dulles declared that the **U. S. policy is to save Israel and not to close the door on possibly selling arms to Israel.**" Dulles warned however that peace in the Middle East "cannot rest on arms alone." Specifically, these pro-Israeli Congressmen request that Israel be permitted to spend \$50 million for U. S. defensive weapons. The announced goal of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) in the United States for the year 1956, is some \$105 million—with half or more allocated to Israel. The sale of Israeli bonds will bring in additional millions. And these 127 members of the House would permit this money to be spent for arms for Israel in violation of the law; specifically Title 18, Criminal Code of the U. S. Statutes, section 13:

"ORGANIZING A MILITARY EXPEDITION AGAINST A FRIENDLY POWER :

Whoever within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States or any of its possessions, knowingly begins or sets foot or provides or prepares a means for or furnishes the money for, or who takes part in, any military or naval expedition or enterprise to be carried on from thence against the territory or dominion of any foreign Prince or State, or of any colony, district or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned not more than three years or both."

The above statutes were deliberately violated by this minority pressure bloc in 1948, at the time of the Israeli-Arab war (See Closer-Up, Sept. 23, 1955.) It is certain to be violated again and without protest from the Administration or the Congress—this being an election year.

THE EISENHOWER "CLOSER TO PEACE" AND DULLES "THRESHOLD OF WAR" STATEMENTS BECOME more understandable in the light of domestic politics. It seems apparent that the Zionist apparatus wants Eisenhower again to carry the Republican colors in the presidential race; if only to retire later and turn the office over to a hand-picked running mate—probably Stassen. If the ailing incumbent should seem inclined to eschew the ardors of another campaign, then the Middle East crisis can be exploited on the basis that "we must not change horses in the middle of the stream." On the other hand, if Eisenhower determines to run of his own free will, we can expect a "play-down" of the Middle East crisis until it bursts upon us as war-in-fact.

WHILE TROUBLE BUBBLES IN THE MIDDLE EAST, NATO MAY BE COLLAPSING IN EUROPE. AGAIN FACTS

are being concealed from the general public; but it is not news in Washington that the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have a genuine fear that the whole Western defense system is about to crack up. Britain, with gold reserves dropping, faced with economic difficulties at home and abroad, is in a bad way; is in no mood to do other than survive. Britain must make whatever concessions seem necessary to maintain her vital trade in the Middle and Far East. Eden came to Washington urging the U. S. to soften its trade embargo against Red China. Only the *degree* of success attained by Mr. Eden is unannounced.

Strongly influencing the British position is the well founded fear that France not only will not stand firm, but that she may go communist in the political sense. In the recent election the Communists (led by Thorez) polled 5,460,000 votes giving them 150 seats in the Assembly. The left-wing Socialists (under Mendez-France) won 181 seats with 5,880,000 votes. The combined Socialist-Communist bloc has 331 seats; and only 298 seats are necessary to control the Assembly. The Conservative bloc (Faure-Pinay) polled 6,300,000 votes to gain 196 seats, the Rightist Extremists (Poujade) received 2,940,000 votes to win 55 seats. So, against the left wing bloc of 331 seats, the combined Conservative and Rightist groups can muster only 251 votes. Various other minority parties control but 12 seats.

There is no majority party in France, political differences between minority parties are delicate but fixed, and long-time blocs are rare. But left wingers usually hold together on economic policy. And with further economic and political distress in France, the Communist-Socialist bloc may take total control. In the event of a war crisis, Britain then might be faced with a potential enemy just across the channel — and NATO troops in Europe would find Communist forces both front and rear — and even in-between.

A PATTERN FOR INTERNAL REVOLUTION MAY BE FORMING IN FRANCE: A BATTLE BETWEEN THE Communists and the Rightists led by Pierre Poujade. The 35 year old, small town shopkeeper stunned older, more experienced politicians with his nearly 3 million votes. Poujade's party is one of most rigid discipline, reminiscent of the early days of the Nazi Party in Germany. Poujade himself threatens death by hanging for any disobedience to party principles on the part of his 55 party members in the Assembly. His campaign was accompanied by open anti-Semitism, and he has not objected to being called "fascist."

Also worthy of note is a recent upsurge of nationalism in Western Germany. How long Chancellor Adenauer can keep this under control is problematical.

THE CONSERVATIVE BLOC ON THE HOME FRONT IS ON THE MOVE!

Substantial and important progress is being made among Conservative and Rightist organizations in the United States; in that they are beginning to combine for political action in this election year. Florida has taken the lead in this respect, the combined groups offering a conservative slate in the coming Democratic primaries. Leading the ticket for Florida's post of Governor is the forthright retired National Guard General Sumter L. Lowry. Born in St. Augustine, educated in Tampa public schools and a graduate of Virginia Military Institute, Gen. Lowry was a Florida National Guardsman for 35 years, served through all ranks and overseas in two World Wars, and holds both the state and national distinguished service medals. 62, he is director of an insurance firm in Tampa. He will campaign openly on the subject of integration in the public schools, which he calls, "the greatest threat to our constitutional government and will destroy our way of life."

General Lowry's announcement is being followed by others for all important state offices — insuring all conservative groups and individuals an opportunity to vote for the principles of state and constitutional rights. Urgent pleas are being made to all conservative groups such as Federation for Constitutional Government, For America, We — The People, the Constitution Party and others to vote for General Lowry and the entire conservative slate. If this is done and an active campaign waged, these candidates *can* be elected, and the delegates to the national convention controlled.

Similar action is being taken in 10 other Southern States; action in still more States is "in the works."

Every Closer-Upper is urged to support this movement for Conservative and Right Wing coalition to select one slate of candidates in every State. Disregard Party labels; form a Third Party if such action seems best for the particular State — but combine and cooperate *on one slate*. Don't split the conservative vote! This may be the last chance we have to create a balance of political power on behalf of State and Constitutional Rights!

CLOSER-UP HAS BEEN ASKED TO EXPLAIN "INTERPOSITION".

The word is being used in news reports but isn't being explained; or, at best is being treated as something of a novelty invented by contemporary Southerners who grope for legal straws and whose mental health is in doubt. Actually, "The Right To Interpose" is an old and honored doctrine which gives the people of the several States the right to call a halt to Federal encroachment, and is directly applicable in the current forced integration controversy.

In the segregation squabble, "Interposition" means this: The Supreme Court exceeded its Constitutional Authority in May 1954 when it handed down a "legislative" decision outlawing segregation. Whenever such an "exceeding of Constitutional Authority" occurs, the State has a historic right to interpose its sovereignty to halt the federal encroachment. The "Right To Interpose" was stated in the Virginia Resolution of 1789: In the event of a "deliberate, palpable and dangerous" exercise by the Federal Government of powers not granted to it by the Constitution, the States who are parties to the Constitution "have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them."

Traditionally, when the "Right To Interpose" is asserted by one or more States, the controversy is referred to the States and the people, and to Congress, by the presentation of a Constitutional Amendment. As it concerns the segregation controversy, it is felt that the necessary three-fourths of the States (36) would never ratify such an amendment to the Federal Constitution and that, therefore, the power to maintain "equal but separate" facilities would be re-affirmed; and the authority-to-segregate or integrate would remain with the States.

There is the legal precedent for such action. In the 1790's, Georgia insisted that the Supreme Court had overstepped its authority in a claims case. The State flatly refused to pay the claim; the Georgia House even passed a bill providing that any marshal who attempted to enforce the Supreme Court order would be hanged. The result of the controversy: the Eleventh Amendment to the Federal Constitution which, in effect, declared Georgia right and the Supreme Court wrong.

The historical and legal background of the "Right To Interpose" has been most ably presented by James J. Kirkpatrick, distinguished editor of the Richmond News-Leader, in "Human Events," December 24, 1955. Copies are available at 6 for \$1.00. Write to Human Events, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Mr. Kirkpatrick, in the 4-page article, makes this important point:

"What could be more capricious than government by a (Supreme) Court that has reversed itself 36 times in the past 18 years? . . . Our hope in espousing the doctrine of interposition is that others will see, as we have come to see so plainly, that Federal encroachments upon the reserved powers of the States far transcend the issue of schools or segregation. . . . If three-fourths of the states agree that this power to operate racially separate but equal schools should be prohibited to the states, then so be it. We will then meet the enormously difficult problems as best we can. But until this verdict is handed down, we can plead only that so violent a disruption in our long established customs, which we ourselves have been struggling desperately to resolve, should not be thrust upon us by judicial fiat alone, but should come as the sober, considered act of not fewer than three-fourths of the sovereign States."

No part of Closer-Up or Don Bell Reports is intended to be mailed, sent in any other manner or handed to members of the armed forces of the United States.

CLOSER-UP is published every other week and sent sealed (first class mail) to subscribers, patriotic organizations and opinion-moulders throughout the United States. The current issue of Don Bell Reports is included with all Closer-Up mailings. Closer-Up only is \$15 per year. Single copies, ten cents each.

DON BELL REPORTS is a weekly service, sent first class postage each Friday. Don Bell Reports only is \$10 per year. However, most subscribers desire the complete service, which includes Closer-Up, Don Bell Reports, and special supplements issued from time to time—complete service—at \$20 per year.

Please make checks and orders payable to: TIME FOR TRUTH PRESS, Inc., P.O.Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida.

105-47766-X
62-0-57008